

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of Telephone Number	)	
Portability	)	
	)	CC Docket No. 95-116
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

COMMENTS OF THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I. INTRODUCTION

The Nebraska Public Service Commission (NPSC) hereby submits these comments in response to the Commission's Public Notice<sup>1</sup> regarding the Petition for Declaratory Ruling filed by T-Mobile USA, inc. ("T-Mobile") and Sprint Nextel Corporation ("Sprint")(collectively "Petitioners") on December 20, 2006. The Petitioners seek a Declaratory Ruling to end an ongoing controversy regarding the Commission's requirement that only "necessary" validation procedures be utilized in the porting process.<sup>2</sup> The NPSC supports the request by the Petitioners and recommends the Commission permit validating on a set of established necessary data fields which are uniform for all carriers.

II. DISCUSSION

The NPSC has long been an advocate of local number portability. The NPSC ardently supported the Commission's efforts to extend the portability requirement to wireless carriers. The Commission's intramodel number portability efforts have been frustrated by the lengthy and burdensome processes imposed by wireline carriers which delay the benefits of competition. The Commission should take this opportunity to

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Public Notice*, WC Docket No. 95-116, DA 07-39 (January 9, 2007).

<sup>2</sup> See *Petition* at 1.

remedy these problems by granting the Petition and requiring only necessary information be provided in order to validate the port.

The North American Numbering Council (NANC) provided guidelines for the wireless intramodal porting process in September of 2000. Since that time, the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) of NANC accepted two Problem Identification and Management issues on the topic of intermodal porting but could not reach consensus and referred the issues to the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Committee in July of 2004.

The NPSC has received numerous accounts of frustration carriers are experiencing with number portability. Problems with the data exchange in the porting process have been reported to the NPSC since mid 2003 when the NPSC was a participant in the Qwest Triennial Review process.

The Petition lists four criteria: (1) 10-digit telephone number (2) customer account number (3) 5-digit zip code; and (4) pass code if applicable. The NPSC does not necessarily believe that the data criteria must be limited to these four criteria, but it does think that the LSRs which contain more than 100 data fields are excessive, burdensome and delay the beneficial effects of competition. The NPSC does not believe that 100 data fields are “necessary” within the meaning of the Commission’s requirement. The NPSC believes the Commission should clarify that the current process is not what it intended when it says that “carriers need only share basic contact and technical information sufficient to perform the port”<sup>3</sup> unless otherwise deemed necessary by the Commission or by NANC with the approval of the Commission.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Petition* at 3 (citing *Wireless Porting Order* ¶ 24).

The NPSC acknowledges that the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Committee is currently grappling with these issues and that it was referred to the OBF Committee in 2004. Failure by the OBF to arrive at a consensus position which provides industry standards for all carriers to utilize for the data fields required for the porting process in a reasonable amount of time should be the trigger for the Commission to step in and set the standard. The amount of time should be limited by the Commission with a hard and fast deadline. If the OBF cannot resolve the issues by the Commission's deadline, the Commission should step in and make the decision as to the applicable standards and process to be used.

The NPSC also agrees with the Petitioners that the porting process should not be changed unilaterally or through some unannounced change. The porting process should be simple, uniform, and should be changed or altered only when necessary after full and adequate disclosure to all affected carriers.

Continued delay in completing a valid port request in a reasonable amount of time is not consistent with the goals of competition. The inability of a consumer to port an existing number in a reasonable period causes consumers time and money. It can also directly impact number conservation if the consumer elects to forego the hassle of porting their existing number and opting for a new number from the new carrier.

### III. CONCLUSION

The NPSC appreciates the concerns voiced by the Petitioners and agrees that the current process needs to be addressed. The current process is burdensome on the wireless carriers and more importantly problematic because it causes delays for consumers. One uniform and simple porting process should be used relative to all providers.

Dated: February 8, 2007.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

/s/ Shana Knutson

Shana Knutson  
Staff Attorney  
Nebraska Public Service Commission  
300 The Atrium Building  
1200 N Street  
Lincoln, NE 68508  
(402)471-3101